

STRATEGY
RESEARCH
PROJECT

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Defense or any of its agencies. This document may not be released for open publication until it has been cleared by the appropriate military service or government agency.

**GENERAL CREIGHTON ABRAMS:
ETHICAL LEADERSHIP AT THE STRATEGIC LEVEL**

BY

COLONEL FRANK B. WEAVER
United States Army

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A:

Approved for public release.
Distribution is unlimited.

USAWC CLASS OF 1999



U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE, CARLISLE BARRACKS, PA 17013-5050

USAWC STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

GENERAL CREIGHTON ABRAMS:

ETHICAL LEADERSHIP AT THE STRATEGIC LEVEL

by

Colonel Frank B. Weaver
United States Army

Dr. Martin Cook
Project Advisor

The views expressed in this academic research paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the official policy or position of the U.S. Government, the Department of Defense, or any of its agencies.

U.S. Army War College
CARLISLE BARRACKS, PENNSYLVANIA 17013

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A:
Approved for public release.
Distribution is unlimited.

ABSTRACT

AUTHOR: Colonel Frank B. Weaver

TITLE: General Creighton Abrams: Ethical Leadership at the Strategic Level.

FORMAT: Strategy Research Project

DATE: ~~01 April 1998~~ PAGES: 39 CLASSIFICATION: Unclassified
14 MAR 1999

According to the Department of the Army FM 100-1, the professional Army ethic is a shared set of values, the guiding beliefs, standards, and ideals that characterize and motivate the Army. Ethical leaders internalize and practice the professional Army ethics elements or values of integrity, duty, loyalty, and selfless service outlined in the Department of the Army FM 22-100. Furthermore, ethical leaders model the professional soldier's core qualities of commitment, competence, candor, and courage discussed in FM 100-1.

This paper examines the values and soldierly core qualities that comprise the Army ethos. Furthermore, it provides examples of these values and qualities that made General Creighton Abrams an ethical leader. General Creighton Abrams demonstrated ethical leader competencies throughout his career.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	v
PREFACE	vii
GENERAL CREIGHTON ABRAMS: ETHICAL LEADERSHIP AT THE STRATEGIC LEVEL	1
INTRODUCTION	1
BACKGROUND	1
CHARACTER	3
INTEGRITY	4
DUTY	9
LOYALTY	14
SELFLESS SERVICE	17
SUMMARY	22
ENDNOTES	25
BIBLIOGRAPHY	29

PREFACE

I dedicate this study to my father, LTC (Retired) William F. Weaver, who served in the United States Army both as an enlisted man and officer for twenty-three and a half years. He had multiple combat tours in Korea as an infantryman and Vietnam as a military police officer. He commanded the Military Police Company organic to the 3rd Armored Division when General Creighton W. Abrams was the Commander.

GENERAL CREIGHTON ABRAMS: ETHICAL LEADERSHIP AT THE STRATEGIC LEVEL

INTRODUCTION

According to the Department of the Army FM 100-1, the professional Army ethic is a shared set of values, the guiding beliefs, standards, and ideals that characterize and motivate the Army.¹ Ethical leaders internalize and practice the professional Army ethics elements or values of integrity, duty, loyalty, and selfless service outlined in the Department of the Army FM 22-100. Furthermore, ethical leaders model the professional soldier's core qualities of commitment, competence, candor, and courage discussed in FM 100-1.

This paper examines the values and soldierly core qualities that comprise the Army ethos. Furthermore, it provides examples of these values and qualities that made General Creighton Abrams an ethical leader. General Creighton Abrams demonstrated ethical leader competencies throughout his career.

BACKGROUND

The United States Army is more than an organization; it is a community of people who share a common set of unique and enduring values, an ethos. This ethos is at the core of everything the

United States Army is and does. This ethos provides the moral foundation for the qualities demanded of all soldiers, from the private on guard duty to the general officer testifying before Congress. Furthermore, this ethos inspires a sense of purpose necessary to sustain our soldiers in war and to resolve the many ambiguities in operations other than war. This firm ethical base is the bedrock of the Army and sets the standard and framework for the correct professional action by leaders and soldiers.

As the United States Army transitions from a Cold War force to a twenty-first century force, it is experiencing change at an unprecedented rate and magnitude. Unfortunately, this change has created extraordinary challenges for the United States Army in the arena of human relations. There have been serious harassment and ethical behavior charges that have resulted in violations of ethics. For example, the leadership in the Army has been tarnished by Skin Head racial incidents. An officer and numerous drill sergeants were convicted of sexual harassment and abuse at training centers. The Sergeant Major of the Army was court-martialed on sexual harassment and assault charges. A divorced major general who allegedly forced a subordinate officer's wife into a sexual relationship was allowed to retire immediately. Whenever these disconnects between our standards of behavior and our actions occur the solution is not to lower our standards but

to maintain our standards by holding those who fail accountable. Furthermore, these actions and conduct raise questions about the United States Army's ethical and moral climate.

Ethics are principles or standards that guide leaders and soldier's to do the moral or right thing-what ought to be done.²

In his book True Faith and Allegiance, Dr. Toner states.

"Ethics comes from the Greek word "ethos," which means habit. Aristotle described the process as follows: "We become just by doing just acts, temperate by doing temperate acts, brave by doing brave acts."³

Ethics derives from custom, from rules (deontology), from goals (teleology), and from circumstances (situationalism).⁴

Leaders have three general ethical responsibilities. First, leaders serve as role models worthy of emulation. Second, leaders develop their subordinates ethically. Third, leaders avoid creating ethical dilemmas for their subordinates.

CHARACTER

Achieving a mature sense of ethics requires character, which is developed by rigorous education and fixed by virtuous habit.⁵ Lewis Sorely defines character as "the commitment to an admirable set of values, and the courage to manifest those values in one's life no matter the cost in terms of personal success or popularity."⁶ The core qualities of commitment, competence,

candor, and courage are the facets of the leaders and soldier's character that undergird the Army ethos. Commitment means dedication to serving the Nation, the Army, the unit, and one's comrades as well as seeing every task to completion.⁷ Competence is finely tuned proficiency.⁸ Candor means unreserved, honest or sincere expression; frankness; freedom from bias, prejudice, or malice.⁹ General William Tecumseh Sherman described courage as "... a perfect sensibility of the measure of danger and a mental willingness to endure it."¹⁰

Doctrinally, the United States Army ethos is based on the values of integrity, duty, loyalty, and selfless service.

INTEGRITY

Integrity is the uncompromising adherence to a code of moral values, utter sincerity, and the avoidance of deception or expediency of any kind.¹¹ Integrity is the basis for leader trust and confidence both professionally and personally and requires adherence to the other values comprising the Army ethos. Integrity embodies a consistency and predictability established and built over time. General Abrams was a man of rock-solid integrity who saw absolutely no room for comprise. Early as a second lieutenant in the 1st Cavalry Division, Abrams was

assigned as a scoring officer in the pits of a rifle range.

After a long day and down to the last firing order, a soldier down to his last shot needed to score a four to achieve an expert rating. He shot and clearly scored a three. A major attempted to persuade Abrams to change the score but he refused. It was, said Abrams, "a small point," but there was no mistaking his view that it was also an important point, one he had remembered in detail a good many years.¹²

Integrity is based on principle, not litigious double talk. Therefore, the cover up of mistakes and responsibility by lying or obfuscation cannot be tolerated. With tank gunnery as the linchpin for the 37th Tank Battalion training program, Abrams himself or one of his experienced staff officers rode on the back of every tank as it went down range in order to score and critique the crew's performance. Some company commanders complained that it made them nervous having a staff officer riding on the turret of their tank. Abrams' response was simple: "If that makes them nervous, what are they going to do when the Germans start shooting at them?"¹³ Complaints ceased about the training technique. He built a competent combat ready organization by implementing an effective challenging training program based upon absolute and uncompromising integrity.

"If a mistake is made, we must face it," he told his officers. "We can't hide it or sweep it under the rug. Don't fiddle with the facts." Then he explained the rationale: "Otherwise the outfit will be hurt if leaders don't play it straight. Later on in combat, when people are dog-tired, scared, hungry, yet they're supposed to get Road Junction 85 in the dark, they are apt to report back that they are ready at Road Junction 85 if they haven't been properly trained. This is wrong," he emphasized, "and it can be disastrous for someone."¹⁴

In the military profession, a breach of your integrity or honesty is always accompanied by a leadership failure. The bottom line for our leadership requirements is that integrity and ethics cannot be taken for granted or treated lightly at any level of interaction. One day, as the 63rd Tank Battalion Commander, he visited the battalion supply section verifying that tent pegs and parts for bunks were on hand. From there he went through one the companies finding a shortage of tent pegs and bunks missing parts. Abrams asked the company commander why there were shortages. "They don't have them over at S-4" the officer replied. Abrams relieved him on the spot.¹⁵ Perry Smith, a former Air Force major General and now a commentator for CNN, says, "of all the qualities a leader must have, integrity is the most important."¹⁶ Abrams said, "Nobody on the face of the earth can take honesty away from anybody; he's got to give it up himself."¹⁷

Leadership demands the integrity of an officer's word and his commitment to the truth. The lack of accountability undermines the trust and confidence so essential to good order and discipline as well as mission success. Abrams saw personal integrity as the heart of professionalism. As the assistant division commander of the 3rd Armored Division at a division command post exercise, the G4 briefed a minefield concept that included the required logistics. The same officer had briefed Abrams the day before on another aspect of the same problem. Abrams quickly realized the briefing charts were the same ones this officer had used as the day prior. He let the officer finish and very quietly began to ask incisive questions. The briefer quickly became tied in knots trying to respond to increasingly detail and probing queries and finally broke down and cried. Abrams stood up. "Gentlemen," he said, "I don't appreciate having anybody lie to me." Then he turned away and walked out of the briefing tent.¹⁸ Those present thought it was a fairly brutal solution to the problem, but nobody doubted that Abrams was serious about integrity.

Integrity involves discerning what is right and what is wrong based on all the facts and the truth. Integrity is one of the basic elements of ethics that leads to trust and confidence

in our leadership, both from above and below. A leader can ill afford to choose deception over honesty and must understand the negative ramifications of situation ethics. As Commander, U.S. Military Assistance Command, Vietnam (MAVC), Abrams published a message concerning integrity. The message prescribed the handling of bad news.

If [an] investigation results in 'bad news,' no attempt will be made to dodge the issue. If an error has been made, it will be admitted..as soon as possible..¹⁹

That was Abrams' view regardless of where the news originated. A case in point was when the Armed Forces Radio network began reporting the antiwar movement in the United States. General Cushman, the Marine Commander, requested termination of such reports.

Abrams replied: "I have your concerned and thoughtful message concerning the current broadcast of the Armed Forces Radio. I have conferred with the officials of this system tonight, and I am satisfied they are presenting a balanced picture of what is now happening in the United States—good and bad within their capabilities. We should never protect our men from the truth because the very system of government for which they fight and sacrifice has its basic strength in its citizenry knowing the facts. I believe the Armed Forces Radio is presenting a balanced set of facts. It is our job to persevere in the atmosphere of the facts. I will direct no change in what is now programmed for the Armed Forces Radio—they are doing a good job."²⁰

Integrity does not accept the toleration of observed wrong actions or the acceptance of an environment that allows wrong

actions to occur. To allow this is a fundamental breakdown in the integrity of the leadership responsibilities and trust placed in the acceptance of one's oath of office. During his Senate nomination hearing both Senator Smith and Senator Thurmond questioned his ethical conduct regarding the rules of engagement in Vietnam--specifically, an unauthorized air attack on a North Vietnamese airfield. Abrams made the following key point that reflected his vision of integrity.

Rules have been our way of life out there, he explained. If I or any other commander of similar rank picks and chooses among the rules, his subordinates are then going to pick and choose among the rules that he gives them. There is no way to stop it and as long as this is the way the mission must be performed, you must adhere to it or it will unravel in a way that you will never be able to control.²¹

The rules have been forever--since we have had them--they have been a source of frustration to many commanders. And they have had to live with them. And they have had to do their job with them. And as senior commander there for the time I was--I couldn't countenance breaking them or I no longer would have been in command, not because I would have been relieved for breaking the rules but I would no longer have had control of the command.²²

DUTY

Duty is behavior required by moral obligation, demanded by custom, or enjoined by feelings of rightness.²³ Duty compels us to do what needs to be done at the right time despite difficulty or danger.²⁴ As Commander of the 63rd Tank Battalion Abrams

developed his subordinates ethically. On one maneuver the battalion's overnight bivouac area was located in sugar beet fields. Abrams instructed his company commanders to place their units in square formations around the edges of the fields. Then he warned them, "Now, if tomorrow morning when I come back here and you have departed and you have bruised even the first leaf on one of these beets, then you will be summarily relieved."²⁵ The next morning Hap Haszard, one of his company commanders, eased out of the position and proceeded down the road. A spotter aircraft informed him that an aggressor regiment was just over the ridge- line to his left. Over the radio, Abrams asked him if he knew what he was doing and Haszard replied roger that. Abrams told him to move out. Haszard, experiencing a rush, roared right down the ridge with his company on line conducting a wild cavalry charge through a peach orchard and beets on the intervening slope to the enemy unit below. It was not until after the battle that Haszard realized what he had done. Haszard did not see Abrams again until redeployment to home station. On the way home, Haszard decided to stop by the club and, to his surprise, Abrams was there. Over a beer Abrams proceeded with the interrogation. Abrams said, "I just wanted to ask you a couple of questions, Lieutenant. Do you recall the morning of such and such when I came down to visit you in that

beet field?" "Yes, sir." "Do you recall what I said?" "Yes, sir-summarily relieved."

"You disobeyed my orders. I watched that attack of yours. I want you to know right now that you caused 50,000 deutsche marks' worth of maneuver damage in that one exercise. Do you realize that?" "Yes, sir."

"Well, I want to tell you that it was worth every goddam cent of it. Now, that does not give you license to interpret my orders. You best be careful in the future. But in that instance, as I view it, the commander on the ground made the decision, and it was the right one." End of conversation.²⁶

Abrams strength of character prevailed by making the right decision based upon his assessment of the situation.

Duty is a personal act of responsibility that compels one to do what is right resulting in obedient and disciplined performance. Leadership by example must come from the top, it must be consistently of the highest standards and it must be visible for all to see. Do as I say and not as I do will not hack it. Abrams believed that it was the chain of command's responsibility to set the example through demonstration. As the 63rd Tank Battalion Commander, Abrams' policy was to pull maintenance during halts on road marches.

So, recalled one of his officers, Abrams would "come out of the turret with his crash helmet on and a cigar sticking out of his mouth, with a sledgehammer hitting the end connectors on the track... and tightening the bolts, checking the oil."²⁷

It is the duty of military leadership to sustain a moral base, a set of ethical values, to keep the military true to the high ideas of our forefathers who provided us the cherished inheritance of freedom. America and the Armed Forces have always stood on the side of right and human decency. Moreover, a leader does not throw these core values away in the process of defending them. As Commander of Military Assistance Command, Vietnam (MACV), Abrams actions regarding the conduct of the war at the tactical level support these ideas. Abrams shifted the tactical focus to the protection of hamlets by smaller forces rather than destruction of enemy forces by battalions. As a consequence, population security, not the over-emphasized and often irrelevant 'body count', became the measure of merit. Only he could approve the application of overwhelming firepower against an inhabited area due to his concern of collateral damage.

"Abe was always trying to get everybody to use appropriate levels of force and violence," observed Ambassador Charles Whitehouse. "One day he had been up somewhere and saw a patrol discover two unarmed VC in a cornfield. 'And what do you think they did?' he asked. 'They called in an air strike, goddamn it!'" Abrams was determined to change things. By the end of the year, said General Maxwell Taylor; "our commanders were operating under the strictest orders ever imposed upon military forces in time of war to use every means to minimize civilian casualties."²⁸

Ambassador Bunker reported that enemy forces were being intercepted outside population centers, at the same

time describing the "great care in our use of air and artillery," which had "resulted in far fewer civilian casualties and property destruction than in May or during Tet."²⁹

Furthermore, Abrams' action demonstrated that he understood that the military must separate the application of military power from wanton, frenzied destruction.³⁰

Duty is accepting responsibility for one's actions and those of subordinates also. It requires the impartial enforcement of standards without regard to rank, personality, friendship, or other bias. Shortly after assuming command of the 63rd Tank Battalion, Abrams assembled the company commanders and executive officers and conducted a tour of the battalion area.

"I have here a stick," Abrams said, "and as we proceed I will say nothing. But if I raise my stick and point at something, if I see it again I'm going to relieve the company commander."³¹

The tour took about half a day to complete. Abrams identified a number of discrepancies such as a tank with the hatches left open with about three feet of water in the hull, a rusty machine gun lying on the fender of a jeep, and a trailer with no cover and a flat tire. Three days later Abrams toured the battalion area again. He found the jeep trailer with the flat tire. True to his word, he relieved the company commander on the spot.

"Then," said another company commander, one, who survived the experience, "it became evident to those of

us that were privileged to be there that he meant goddamn business. There was no more fooling around. I mean, it just stopped."³²

LOYALTY

Loyalty to the nation stems from the oath that all soldiers take and obligates one to support and defend the Constitution.³³ A leader contributes to the defense of our nation by contributing to their unit's mission and combat readiness. Success in combat, which is our business, depends on trust and confidence in our leaders and each other. Abrams understood that unit and leadership training are essential to mission success and survivability on the battlefield. As the ADC and Commander of the 3rd Armored Division, his training philosophy was that tough, realistic, and authentic training supported fidelity to purpose and ultimately prevented military incompetence. When Abrams arrived in the division, the unit annual training test was a highly structured exercise complete with detailed checklists associated with each phase. This canned scenario produced a well-rehearsed play that was not very instructive tactically. He implemented a much more dynamic testing approach using opposing forces that provided much more latitude for initiative and tactical innovation.

The division tank gunnery program exhibited the same kinds of problems. The firing exercises involved two members of the crew engaging targets from the halt, stationary and moving positions. Abrams viewed this as a total waste of time and ammunition. He implemented a dynamic approach that involved the entire crew using every weapon to engage a series of targets presented in random sequence during both day and night operations. The result produced a far better trained and more confident crew. This eventually evolved into a series of firing tables conducted on ranges built for that purpose at Grafenwhor. According to Lieutenant General Jock Sutherland, who served as a combat command commander in the division, "That change was brought about due in large measure to the efforts of General Abrams."³⁴

Furthermore, there can be no compromise of loyalty in a profession where the ultimate a leader can demand of a subordinate is that they lay their life on the line in the execution of your orders. As Chief of Staff of the Army, Abrams concern with leadership training conducted at West Point illustrates this fact. He believed the training did not resemble the real Army and therefore its graduates were unprepared to deal with the professional environment in which they had to operate in upon commissioning. In his article "Creighton Abrams and West

Point," Abrams expounded his concerns to the Superintendent, Major General Sidney Berry.

He said to serve and to lead were an opportunity and a privilege, and that West Pointers must understand and believe that. And, he said, we need lieutenants who like to work with them.

"West Point's goal should be to develop leaders who make the difference between winning and losing," said Abrams, and he explained why this was so important.

"Ultimately the Army makes the difference between survival and disappearance of the country, between anarchy and civil authority, between victory and defeat," he said. "And it is soldiers who pay most of the human cost. In war, it is extraordinary how it all comes down to the character of one man."³⁵

Loyalty to the unit encompasses the obligation between leaders, the led, and the shared commitment of soldiers for one another. Moreover, loyalty is a two-way street. The following example exhibits that Abrams realized this. As the Assistant Division Commander (ADC) of the 3rd Armored Division at a combat command headquarters command and staff meeting, Abrams observed the commander badmouthing the support he was receiving from the division's service elements in front of a number of visitors there to observe the winter maneuver.

Abrams took the floor. "In the 3rd Armored Division," he told the assembled commanders and staff, "there are no 'goddamn' engineers, no 'goddamn' ordnance officers, or 'goddamn' artillerymen. We are all part of the team and, while we might discuss our problems face to face with each other and have honest disagreements and complaints when we are talking about a unit of this

division, it's 'that great old 23d' or 'the solid 102nd,' and they are part of our team."³⁶

SELFLESS SERVICE

Selfless service puts the welfare of the nation and the accomplishment of the mission ahead of individual desires.³⁷

Selfless service requires leaders to resist the temptation to put personal advantage, self-gain, and self-interests above what is best for their unit, Army, or nation. Leaders who elevate their personal well being above their mission accomplishment are guilty of crass careerism, the kind of egoism that can have no proper home in the military ethic.³⁸ As the Vice Chief and Chief of Staff of the Army, Abrams clearly demonstrated the aforementioned values. During his tenure as the Vice Chief of Staff, the Johnson administration implemented the Gulf of Tonkin resolution thereby increasing American involvement in the Vietnam War without the mobilization of the reserve components. President Johnson's refusal to mobilize the reserve components was partially motivated by his reluctance to spread the impact of the war throughout the population. Abrams addressed this issue candidly in a briefing to a newly appointed civilian official.

"I must have misunderstood you-you and your people, General Abrams," said the civilian. Everybody isn't getting drafted fairly?" Abrams looked him right in the eye. "Mr. Secretary," he told him, "the only

Americans who have the honor to die for their country in Vietnam are the dumb, the poor and the black."³⁹

The most prominent illustration of Abrams selfless service occurred as the Army Chief of Staff. Abrams inherited an all-volunteer post Vietnam Army plagued by negative public and congressional sentiments, a rapidly declining force structure under-financed and under-resourced, and in dire need of restoring its culture, climate, morale, standards, and integrity. Secretary of Defense James Schlesinger approved a package of initiatives from Abrams that stabilized the force and prevented new initiatives by the administration for further reductions in Army structure and manpower and aided the materiel improvement of the existing force. These initiatives increased the combat power of the approved force through restructuring; and increased the readiness of the Reserve Components by integrating them into the total force. The efficient restructuring of the approved force improved the Army image internally and externally due to the elimination of unnecessary elements and functions. "As the tooth-to-tail ratio was adjusted in favor of greater combat power (more tooth), the outlook on the Army of both Congress and the Department of Defense improved."⁴⁰ The active-reserve force "round-out" concept was the mechanism to prevent the "total

force" debacle that resulted from President Johnson's decision not mobilize the reserve components during the Vietnam War. Additionally, he enhanced the role of women by their integration into all skills, branches, and units other than the combat arms. Furthermore, he directed the increased representation of minorities in the Army that diametrically opposed the American society racist view of minorities. Although politically not correct at that time, in conflict with the norms of society, and at great risk to his career, Abrams demonstrated the moral courage to not only speak out for but to implement programs that have been credited to the success of the Army during the Gulf War.

Through selfless service leaders develop unit cohesion, teamwork, and unity of effort. These are essential prerequisites to mission accomplishment. As the 3rd Armored Division Commander, Abrams exhibited this characteristic. Shortly after assuming command Abrams reviewed the training program. He found a two-inch document that spelled out in great detail the exact subjects and hours of instruction all the way down to company level. Unit commanders had little impact on their training programs.

Abrams told Lieutenant Colonel Edward Bautz, the division operations officer, to revise it on two pieces of paper. Bautz replied: "Sir, there's no way you can

put that division training program on two pieces of paper. You've got all these 7th Army requirements; you've got all these V Corps requirements. You just can't do that."

Abrams looked at Bautz. "Colonel, I'll go over this for you one more time. I want you to re-do that training program, and I want you to put it on two sheets of paper." Bautz had the message. "Yes, sir," he said, picking up the document and heading out. Just as he reached the door, Abrams relented-but just a little. With a faint smile he said, "Say, Eddie, you can use both sides of the paper."⁴¹

The revised document only contained the basic training policies thereby giving the subordinate commanders the responsibility of determining their training needs. Abrams reasoned that subordinate commanders were in the best position to know the strengths and weaknesses of their unit's, not staff officers at higher headquarters. Retired Lieutenant General Harris Hollis stated in an article in Military Review.

Abrams saw the evils of overcentralization-that which enervates and saps vitality, that takes the initiative from the rank and file, that makes a mold and jams the soldier into it: "They (our company commanders) are now bound hand and foot by a whole new list of mandatory subjects...You've delegated to the commander only the choice of what he is going to catch hell for."⁴²

Abrams practiced the adage "to command is to exercise moral as well as military authority. Incompetence means moral failure."⁴³

As the division commander Abrams' troops and subordinate leaders responded to the confidence he displayed in them. Abrams

stated in his Army magazine article "Readiness: To Fight a War, To Keep the Peace."

The Army must maintain a chain of command which provides freedom for junior leaders, commissioned and noncommissioned, to make decisions, to lead their units and care for their men in their own way, consistent with professional standards. They must be granted the chance to operate without a senior looking over their shoulders, making decisions for them or second-guessing them.⁴⁴

This quality impressed Mr. Paul Ignatius, then assistant secretary of the Army. On a tour of installations in Europe Mr. Ignatius spent several days with the 3rd Armored Division while training in Grafenwohr. Most commanders would stage such a visit, but not Abrams.

He and Ignatius would arrive at the training area, land the helicopter, and then, Ignatius remembered, "General Abrams would disappear, and I must say that I did not find in subsequent visits, and I made many to military installations, in all of the services, an officer who was always willing to do that. He would simply disappear, and I was in the hands of the sergeant or the junior officer for as long as I wanted to spend; he wasn't standing by listening to what they were saying or coaching them in their answers." This was, Ignatius felt, "an indication of the confidence he had in his people, and really the confidence he had in himself."⁴⁵

Furthermore, selfless military service demands a willingness to sacrifice oneself in the accomplishment of the mission. During the relief of Bastogne, Abrams showed this. Abrams' 37th Tank Battalion spearheaded the planned attack along an axis

defined by successive towns to be assaulted en route to Bastogne. The tactical situation dictated that a different route of advance would achieve the objective much earlier with fewer casualties than the planned route. Without hesitation and authorization from his commander, Abrams attacked and secured a corridor leading into Bastogne. Brigadier General Hal Pattison, former Army Chief of Military History, stated that Abrams' commander was weak and probably would not have authorized the change.

"Not too many.... commanders over the course of history...." said Pattison, "have had the courage to make the right decision in the face of the wrong orders." Pattison thought there wasn't any question but that, tactical, Abrams did the right thing, and also demonstrating in the course of it the moral courage that so strongly marked him.⁴⁶

Abrams demonstrated the moral courage to do the right thing in the face of wrong orders.

SUMMARY

Ethical leaders internalize and practice the professional Army ethics elements or values of integrity, duty, loyalty, and selfless service outlined in the Department of the Army FM 22-100. Furthermore, ethical leaders model the professional soldier's core qualities of commitment, competence, candor, and courage discussed in FM 100-1. Throughout his career General

Abrams demonstrated that he was stalwart proponent and steward of ethical leadership. His ethical leadership served as a role model to subordinates, peers, and superiors. Some twenty years ago Army Chaplain Kermit Johnson declared: "The task of building an ethical environment where leaders and all personnel are instructed, encouraged, and rewarded for ethical behavior is a matter of first importance."⁴⁷

WORD COUNT = 5,984

ENDNOTES

¹ Department of the Army, The Army, Field Manual FM 100-1 (Washington, D.C.: Headquarters Department of the Army, 14 June 1994), 5.

² Department of the Army, Military Leadership, Field Manual FM 22-100 (Washington, D.C.: Headquarters Department of the Army, 31 June 1990), 30.

³ James H. Toner, True Faith and Allegiance The Burden of Military Ethics, (The University Press of Kentucky, 1995) 54.

⁴ Ibid, 21.

⁵ Ibid, 21.

⁶ Ibid, 18.

⁷ Department of the Army, The Army, Field Manual FM 100-1 (Washington, D.C.: Headquarters Department of the Army, 14 June 1994), 7.

⁸ Ibid, 8.

⁹ Ibid, 8.

¹⁰ Ibid, 9.

¹¹ Ibid, 7.

¹² Lewis Sorley, Thunderbolt, (New York, N.Y., Simon and Schuster, 1992) 26.

¹³ Ibid, 41.

¹⁴ Ibid, 39-40.

¹⁵ Lewis Sorely, "The Art of Taking Charge," Across The Board, (May 1992), 34.

¹⁶ James H. Toner, True Faith and Allegiance The Burden of Military Ethics, (The University Press of Kentucky, 1995) 64.

¹⁷ Lewis Sorely, "The Art of Taking Charge," Across The Board, (May 1992), 34.

¹⁸ Lewis Sorely, "Creighton Abrams and Levels of Leadership," Military Review, (August 1992), 5.

¹⁹ Lewis Sorley, Thunderbolt, (New York, N.Y., Simon and Schuster, 1992) 243.

²⁰ Ibid, 244.

²¹ U.S. Senate. Committee on Armed Services. Nomination of Gen. Creighton W. Abrams, U.S. Army, to be Chief of Staff, U.S. Army, 92nd Congress, 2nd session, 13 September 1972, 108.

²² Ibid, 114.

²³ Department of the Army, The Army, Field Manual FM 100-1 (Washington, D.C.: Headquarters Department of the Army, 14 June 1994), 6.

²⁴ Ibid, 6.

²⁵ Lewis Sorely, "The Art of Taking Charge," Across The Board, (May 1992), 35.

²⁶ Ibid, 35.

²⁷ Lewis Sorely, Thunderbolt, (New York, N.Y., Simon and Schuster, 1992), 112.

²⁸ Ibid, 235-236.

²⁹ Ibid, 239.

³⁰ James H. Toner, True Faith and Allegiance The Burden of Military Ethics, (The University Press of Kentucky, 1995) 21.

³¹ Lewis Sorely, "Creighton W. Abrams and the Art of Taking Charge," Friends of the West Point Library NEWSLETTER, Number 22, (May 1993).

³² Ibid.

³³ Department of the Army, Military Leadership, Field Manual FM 22-100 (Washington, D.C.: Headquarters Department of the Army, 31 July 1990), 29.

³⁴ Lewis Sorely, "Creighton Abrams and Levels of Leadership," Military Review, (August 1992), 4.

³⁵ Lewis Sorely, "Creighton Abrams and West Point," Assembly, (July 1992), 10.

³⁶ Lewis Sorely, "Creighton Abrams and Levels of Leadership," Military Review, (August 1992), 4.

³⁷ Department of the Army, The Army, Field Manual FM 100-1 (Washington, D.C.: Headquarters Department of the Army, 14 June 1994), 7.

³⁸ James H. Toner, True Faith and Allegiance The Burden of Military Ethics, (The University Press of Kentucky, 1995) 68.

³⁹ Lewis Sorely, Thunderbolt, (New York, N.Y., Simon and Schuster, 1992), 183.

⁴⁰ Lewis Sorley, "Creighton Abrams and Active-Reserve Integration in Wartime," Parameters, (Summer 1991) 45

⁴¹ Lewis Sorley, Thunderbolt, (New York, N.Y., Simon and Schuster, 1992) 148.

⁴² Harris W. Hollis, "The Heart and Mind of Creighton Abrams," Military Review, (April 1985), 61.

⁴³ James H. Toner, True Faith and Allegiance The Burden of Military Ethics, (The University Press of Kentucky, 1995) 44.

⁴⁴ Creighton Abrams, "Readiness: To Fight a War, To Keep the Peace," Army, (October 1973), 19.

⁴⁵ Lewis Sorely, "Creighton Abrams and Levels of Leadership," Military Review, (August 1992), 9-10.

⁴⁶ Lewis Sorely, "On Knowing When to Disobey Orders: Creighton Abrams and the Relief of Bastogne," Armor, (September-October 1992), 8.

⁴⁷ James H. Toner, True Faith and Allegiance The Burden of Military Ethics, (The University Press of Kentucky, 1995) 135.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abrams, Creighton "Readiness: To Fight a War, To Keep the Peace", Army, October 1973, 18-20.

Flanagan, Edward M. "Abe: His Wit and Wisdom", Army, February 1977, 40-44.

Hollis, Harris W. "The Heart and Mind of Creighton Abrams", Military Review, April 1985, 58-65.

McHugh, Jane "Explain Sex Scandals", Army Times, 7 July 1997, 13.

McHugh, Jane "Did the General get a break", Army Times, 13 April 1998, 4.

Naylor, Sam D. "Sex charges rock Aberdeen, Army", Army Times, 18 November 1996, 3.

Reimer, Dennis, One Team, One Fight, One Future, Department of the Army Pamphlet.

Romjue, John L., Canedy, Susan, Chapman, Anne W., Prepare The Army For War A Historical Overview of the Army Training and Doctrine Command, 1973-1993, (Fort Monroe, Virginia, Office of the Command Historian United States Army Training and Doctrine Command), 6-7.

Scales, Robert H., Brigadier General, Certain Victory The U.S. Army In The Gulf War, (New York, N.Y., Simon and Schuster, 1994), 18-20.

Sorley, Lewis, Thunderbolt, (New York, N.Y., Simon and Schuster, 1992).

Sorley, Lewis "On Knowing When to Disobey Orders: Creighton Abrams and the Relief of Bastogne", Armor, September-October 1992, 6-9.

Sorley, Lewis "Relief of Bastogne", Assembly, September 1992, 24-27, 43.

Sorley, Lewis "The Art of Taking Charge", Across The Board, May 1992, 29-35.

Sorely, Lewis "Creighton W. Abrams and the Art of Taking Charge",
Friends of the West Point Library Newsletter, Number 22, May
1993.

Sorley, Lewis "Creighton Abrams and Levels of Leadership",
Military Review, August 1992, 3-10.

Sorley, Lewis "Gen Creighton Abrams Orchestrated 1970 Cambodia
Incursion", National Guard, July 1992, 20-23.

Sorley, Lewis "Creighton Abrams and West Point", Assembly, July
1992, 8-10.

Sorely, Lewis "Creighton Abrams and Active-Reserve Integration in
Wartime," Parameters, (Summer 1991), 35-49.

Smith, DeWitt C. "Tribute to General Creighton W. Abrams Jr."
Encomium, Chapel, US Army War College, 06 September 1974.

Starry, Donn A. "Dedication of Abrams Loop at the US Army Command
and General Staff College", Military Review, LXI, no. 9
September 1979, 36-42.

Toner, James H. True Faith and Allegiance The Burden of Military
Ethics, (The University Press Of Kentucky 1995).

U.S. Department of the Army, Leadership and Command at Senior
Levels, Field Manual FM 22-103, Washington, D.C.: Department
of the Army, 21 June 1987.

U.S. Department of the Army, Military Leadership, Field Manual FM
22-100, Washington, D.C.: Department of the Army, 31 July
1990.

U.S. Department of the Army, The Army, Field Manual FM 100-1,
Washington, D.C.: Department of the Army, 14 June 1994.

U.S. Department of the Army, United States Army Posture Statement
FY99, United States Senate and the House of Representatives,
Second Session, 105th Congress, February 1998.

U.S. Senate. Committee on Armed Services. Nomination of Gen.
Creighton W. Abrams, U.S. Army, to be Chief of Staff, U.S.
Army, 92nd Congress, 2nd session, 13 September 1972, 101-153

U.S. Senate. Subcommittee on Defense Committee on Appropriations.
Posture Statement of U.S. Army by General Creighton W.

Abrams, U.S. Army, Chief of Staff, U.S. Army, 93rd Congress,
2ND session, 29 March 1973, 1-36.

Willis, G.E. "It's over - What's next", Army Times, 30 March
1998, 12, 16.